

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	O. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO		
09/848,940	(05/04/2001	Todd W. Herrick	C-472/TEC1154	C-472/TEC1154 8491		
832	7590	08/02/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
BAKER &		_	ABRAMS, NEIL				
111 E. WAYNE STREET SUITE 800				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
FORT WAYNE, IN 46802				2839			

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/848,940	HERRICK					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Neil Abrams	2839					
The MAILING DATE of this communica Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence addre	ess				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) data of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a cation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of the cry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC, by statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this commandable (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on <u>28 June 2004</u> .						
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)	∑ This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
 4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-27 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are versions. 5) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-15 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 16-24,26 and 27 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 25 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction. 	withdrawn from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do 2. Certified copies of the priority do 3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internationa * See the attached detailed Office action for	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in the priority documents have bee I Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National St	age				
Attachment(s)							
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	9-948) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-1	52)				

Application/Control Number: 09/848,940

Art Unit: 2839

Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In each of claims 10, 20, steps of placing have no antecedent basis.

Claims 16-23, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paterek in view of Mattis, lizuka, Katoh, Onoda and Okabe.

Paterek and lizuka are discussed in last office action. For claims 16, 21, Paterek fig. 2 does not include a free volume/cavity between 14 and layer 10 filled with a gel that is to cure into a solid state. Onoda at 140, Katoh at 19 and Mattis, col. 7, and figs. 8, 9 disclose materials, such as gels, sealants, to be placed between mating connectors. It would have been obvious to use such materials in Paterek to provide better sealing in the space adjacent layer 10. Also obvious to allow the material to "harden into a solid state" as taught by Onoda, col. 1, lines 58 and Okabe at 36. This would also serve to better seal the system. Also, note applicant's spec. page 14, lines 6, 7, in which it appears indicated that the "curing to solid form" is a matter of choice producing no stated advantage. Claims 17, 20 22, 23, met by above combination.

For claim 21 "cluster block free volume" as broadly defined met by above combination and also by spaces 9 about wires 11. To fill spaces 9 with epoxy would be obvious in view of Okabe at 5. This change would provide sealing at the wires.

Claims 22, 23, 26, 27 met by references so applied. For claim 18, the, front opening at 22 forms an aperture for filling the cluster block. For claim 24, openings 9 form free volume into which epoxy may be inserted. Note that claims 18, 19 do not

Application/Control Number: 09/848,940

Art Unit: 2839

require placing dielectric into the Paterek space at 10 and would be met by dielectric filling at openings 9. Such step would be an obvious choice.

Claims 1, 2, 4-15 are allowed.

Claim 25 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: For claims 1, 9, 25, these claims require ingress means for filling a cavity at the mating faces, after connectors are joined. See fig. 8. While Leitmann at P discloses use of such an ingress port for epoxy filling, that patent and Paterek are to connectors of entirely different function and structure and therefore Leitmann cannot properly be applied to suggest use of ingress port/epoxy fill for the Paterek device.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment and pertinent to claims now rejected have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. ***.

See above discussion.

For page 11, lines 20-22, argument is not understood; Onoda is seen to disclose sealing resin 140 used to fill a space between connector 100 and a mating connector.

Application/Control Number: 09/848,940

Art Unit: 2839

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at

telephone number (571)272-2089.

Abrams/ds

07/27/04

MEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER

Page 4

ART UNIT 322